

APPLICATION
for a
PUBLIC FACILITY
Idaho Community Development
Block Grant
By
POTLATCH, IDAHO



for
SEWER SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

Dave Brown, Mayor

November 21, 2008

walter m. steed
& associates
PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

1345 Ridgeview Drive
Moscow, Idaho 83843
(208) 883-0123

November 21, 2008

Donald A. Dietrich, Director
Idaho Department of Commerce
700 West State Street
Boise, ID 83720

Dear Mr. Dietrich:

The City of Potlatch, Idaho respectfully submits this application for a \$500,000 Idaho Community Development Block Grant. The City's sewer collection system was installed in 1909 and, while having been maintained, has now exceeded its useful life. Due to inflow and infiltration, rainfall events cause the system to experience 200 to 300 percent increases in flow. As this affects the efficiency of the lagoon treatment system, a full replacement of all collection lines has been recommended. In addition to recent violations reported in March of 2007 for Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) removal infractions, the City received notification from the Environmental Protection Agency on January 23, 2007 regarding an October 5, 2006 Compliance Inspection. Further EPA action could be forthcoming.

Today, the City of Potlatch consists of 791 persons who in August of 2007, by an 83% positive vote, taxed themselves to pay for a \$4,900,000 sewer revenue bond. In 2008 construction was commenced on the first phase of sewer main replacement, with a portion of the bond being used as match for a CDBG application. The remaining bond issue amount is being used as match for this application.

Specifically, this project's work will consist of the replacement of over two (2) miles of 8" sewer mains and almost 50 manholes. Additionally, a force main to the sewer lagoons will be replaced and the lagoons will be lined to prevent leaking.

Having a very porous sewer collection system sends ground water to the sewer lagoons, which impairs their ability to effectively treat the wastewater. Discharging into the Palouse River necessitates monitoring of the effluent and, if the discharge is not adequately treated, violations result. This is a very much-needed project to allow Potlatch to continue to exist and grow. Thank you for your consideration.

Yours truly,

Dave Brown, Mayor
City of Potlatch

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ICDBG APPLICATION FORM	1
ECONOMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL PAGE	2
THRESHOLD CRITERIA.	3
GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION	5
BUDGET NARRATIVE	8
BUDGET FORM	9
DETAILED COST ANALYSIS	10
PROJECT SCHEDULE.	11
FINANCIAL PROFILES.	12
COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE.	16
REVIEW AND RANKING NARRATIVE.	17
CERTIFICATIONS.	21
ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING.....	22
APPENDIX.....	26

IV. ICDBG Application Information Form

Applicant: City of Potlatch

Chief Elected Official: Dave Brown, Mayor

Address: PO Box 525, Potlatch ID 83855

Phone: (208) 875-0708

Application Prepared By: Walter M. Steed & Associates

Phone: (208) 883-0123

Address: 1345 Ridgeview Drive, Moscow, Idaho 83843

Architect/Engineer/Planner: Chris Mansfield, P.E., Taylor Engineering, Inc. Phone: (509) 328-3371

Address: West 106 Mission, Spokane WA 99201

NATIONAL OBJECTIVE (MARK ONE)

☒ LMI Area ☐ LMI Clientele

☐ LMI Jobs ☐ Slum & Blight

☐ Imminent Threat

PROJECT TYPE (MARK ONE)

☒ Public Facility/
Housing ☐ Community Center

☐ Economic Development ☐ Senior Center

☐ Imminent Threat ☐ Other

PROJECT POPULATION TO BENEFIT (PERSONS): (Census/Survey/Clients/Jobs)

TOTAL # TO BENEFIT: 791

TOTAL # LMI TO BENEFIT: 404

% LMI TO BENEFIT: 51.09%

% MINORITY POPULATION: 14.9%

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Replacement of over two (2) miles of 8" sewer mains and 47 manholes. Additionally, 250 LF of force main will be replaced and the lagoons will be lined.

SOURCE	AMOUNT	DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED	RESERVED/ CONDITIONAL AWARD	FUNDS COMMITTED/ CONTRACT AWARD DATE	DOCUMENTATION IN APPENDIX ***
ICDBG	\$500,000				
Local Cash	4,500			11-08	3
Local Loan*	3,123,392			11-08	3
Local In-Kind**					
USDA-RD Grant	1,631,000			11-08	3
EDA Grant					
State Grant					
Foundation Grant					
Private Investment					
Other (identify)					
TOTAL PROJECT FINANCING	\$5,258,892				

* Identify Loan Source(s) USDA-RD Date Bond or Necessary and Ordinary Passed 8/7/07

**Describe In-Kind match by type (i.e. materials, labor, waived fees, land value) and amount.

***Identify which appendix corresponding documentation is in. Documentation should be a letter from the appropriate source.

V. Economic Advisory Council Page: Summarize the project need, how the need will be addressed, total project cost, the local ability to finance the project, the local effort and commitment, and the local and regional economic impact.

Critical health and safety concerns are the paramount reasons for funding this application. The City's sewer collection system was installed in 1909 and, while having been maintained, is currently in disrepair and has exceeded its useful life. During rainfall events the system is experiencing 200 to 300 percent increases in flow. A full replacement has been recommended in order to eliminate excessive inflow and infiltration, and consequently improve the treatment efficiency of the lagoon system. In addition to recent violations reported in March of this year for Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) removal infractions, the City received notification from the EPA on January 23, 2007 regarding an October 5, 2006 Compliance Inspection.

Thomas J. Moore, P.E., Regional Engineering Manager for the Department of Environmental Quality in Lewiston said in his October 12, 2007, letter, "After seeing the video inspections obtained for the Facility Plan, it is apparent that the City sewer system is severely compromised and promptly replacing these sewer lines is in order." He goes on to say, "The DEQ Lewiston Region Office considers this project to be an excellent opportunity to reduce possible impacts to the Palouse River. We recommend that Commerce help the City complete their improvement plan by providing CDBG funding for this project." A copy of his letter may be found in Appendix 7.

The City of Potlatch consists of 791 persons who have voted to tax themselves to pay for a \$4,900,000 sewer revenue bond, which will leverage \$1,631,000 in grant funds from USDA-Rural Development. This bond issue will raise the monthly residential sewer fee to almost \$80.00 including O & M and a reserve fund amount for future system improvements. Rates would be even higher without CDBG funds providing some relief to the citizens.

In November 2007 the City applied for and was awarded a CDBG to help fund Phase I of a project to replace some sanitary sewer mains in the City. That project is under construction. It is now time to build Phase II; the replacement of the remaining two (2) miles of the sanitary sewer mains, to replace a force main under the river and to line the sewer lagoons.

Local economic impact will be evident by having a viable sewer system, which will allow for growth and thus insure the community's future. The impact of a successful Block Grant application will be to protect health and safety and to boost the economy of the community.

VI. Threshold Criteria

A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANT:

The applicant is a City ☒ The applicant is a County ☐

If the applicant is sponsoring a subrecipient or this is a joint application, describe the relationship and attach a draft agreement between the parties. Indicate if the subrecipient is a faith-based organization.

There is no sub-recipient.

B. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES:

List the eligible activities identified from Chapter 2 that are part of the project.

Public Facilities and Improvements

Administrative Activities

C. NATIONAL OBJECTIVE: There are six National Objectives listed below. Complete only the National Objective that will be met with the project.

C.1. Low-and-Moderate-Income Area Benefit:

Total Number of Households in Project Benefit Area* 357

***Note: For water and sewer projects, this is the number of households hooked onto the system and any households that will hook onto the system once the project is complete.**

For a 2003 water project a LMI survey was performed which indicated 57.4% LMI. To save the cost of a survey and since the census shows greater than 51%, that method is used for this application.

LMI Percentage Determined by: (Check one and complete requested information)

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Survey** (survey requirements in Chapter 3)</p> <p>Survey Report, Sample Survey, Survey Tabulation, Boundary Map*** are found in Appendix _____</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 3_Census (BG=Block Group) List the BG for each tract</p> <p>Tract_____BG_____BG_____BG_____BG_____</p> <p>Tract_____BG_____BG_____BG_____BG_____</p> <p>Tract_____BG_____BG_____BG_____BG_____</p>
--	---

** Survey methodology and documents must have prior approval from DOC staff

***Survey Area must match Project Benefit Area

D. Citizen Participation:

Describe the citizen involvement in selecting the project and reviewing the application.

Describe compliance with the citizen participation plan and any other community plans.

A public hearing on the proposed project and bond election was held in June 2007 in preparation for the bond election held in August 2007. A second public meeting to discuss the project was held in July 2007 and a third in October 2007. As required by Section 074.05(c), a Citizen Participation Plan was adopted November 5, 2003. In accordance with the Citizens Participation Plan and as required by Section 074.05(d), a Notice of Public Hearing was published in the local newspaper more than seven (7) days prior to a public hearing on this CDBG application which was held on October 13, 2008 to receive written and oral comments on the public's perception of the project and to review this Application. A copy of the plan, public notice, affidavit of publication, meeting minutes and sign-in list of attendees is in Appendix 4.

Date of Public Notice: October 2, 2008

Date of Public Hearing: October 13, 2008

E. Statewide Goals and Strategies:

Identify the goals and strategies that correspond to the project. Describe how the project meets the identified strategies and goal.

GOAL: This project will enhance the wastewater treatment system in the City to provide a suitable living environment.

STRATAGIES:

- a) Improving safety and livability in the community by;
- b) Increasing access to quality facilities and services through replacement of the sewer collection system and improvements to the sewer treatment plant.

F. Administrative Capacity:

- 1. Describe applicant's and sub-recipient's (if applicable) ability to manage the project as indicated in Part A. of this Chapter.**

The City of Potlatch, governed by a mayor and four council persons, employs a city staff of a full time City Clerk/Treasurer who handles the day-to-day activities of the City and a part time clerk who provides coverage and additional help when utility bills are being processed. The City also has two full time maintenance persons. There have been no previous findings or recall elections. The Mayor and City Clerk have each held their position for several years and the Council sees little turn over due to the community's small size and the relatively small number of persons willing to serve.

2. Identify steps taken or to be taken to procure a certified grant administrator.

The City has, after following appropriate procurement practices, hired W. M. Steed & Associates of Moscow, an Idaho Department of Commerce certified grant administrator, to assist in the making of this application and to provide administrative services for the project. The city has also hired, through proper procurement processes, Taylor Engineering, Inc. of Lewiston to act as project engineer for the preliminary engineering report and for design and construction. Documentation of the selection processes may be found in Appendix 5 & 6.

G. Fair Housing:

For Public Facility/Housing and Downtown Revitalization projects submit Fair Housing documentation with addendum. For all other projects submit with application.

To be submitted with Addendum.

VII. Program Income: Describe if the project will generate program income and the reuse plan.

Program Income is not a part of this project.

VIII. General Project Description: Include the general project description as outlined in the narrative for this section. Be sure to address all the required details.

A. Community Description:

Describe the applicant's community by size, location, and economy as indicated in Part A of this Chapter.

See Appendix 10 for the County's Labor Market profile from website www.lmi.idaho.gov.

B. Community Needs Assessment:

Complete the chart below and provide a narrative to identify how all the community's needs have been assessed and how the proposed project is a priority in comparison to other community needs.

Facilities & Infrastructure	Poor	Fair	Good	Previously ICDBG funded
Water			X	Yes
Sewer	Very			Yes
Electrical			X	
Fire			X	
Hospitals	None –Nearest 25 miles away			

Facilities & Infrastructure	Poor	Fair	Good	Previously ICDBG funded
Housing		X		
Roads			X	
Railroads		X		
Airport	None			
Broadband			Wireless Broadband	
Senior Center		X		
Community Center			X	
Community Recreation Facilities			City Park	
Employment Opportunities	X			
Other				

Narrative: In the narrative explain why the project facility or infrastructure is in poor condition and how the project is a priority over the other facilities and infrastructures listed in poor condition.

The City's sewer collection system was installed in 1909 and, while having been maintained, is currently in disrepair and has exceeded its useful life. During rainfall events the system is experiencing 200 to 300 percent increases in flow. A full replacement has been recommended in order to eliminate excessive inflow and infiltration, and consequently improve the treatment efficiency of the lagoon system. In addition to recent violations reported in March of 2007 for Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) removal infractions, the City received notification from the EPA on January 23, 2007, regarding problems with an October 5, 2006, Compliance Inspection.

In 2004, with the coming of a new city council, the City had to choose between either repairing their very leaky water system or their very leaky sewer system. As the water system was costing so much to run their wells almost 24 hours a day, they elected to replace the water transmission system and line their 1910, 1.0 million gallon concrete water storage reservoir. This paid off as the wells are now running only about 20% of the time and power bills have been dramatically reduced. In November 2007, the City began to tackle the similarly old and leaky wastewater collection system by applying for a Phase I CDBG. That project, consisting of replacement of over two (2) miles of 8" and 12" sewer mains and over 50 manholes, is under construction and now is time to continue improvements by funding Phase II.

Thomas J. Moore, P.E., Regional Engineering Manager for the Department of Environmental Quality in Lewiston said in his October 12, 2007, letter, "After seeing the video inspections obtained for the Facility Plan, it is apparent that the City sewer system is severely compromised and promptly replacing these sewer lines is in order." He goes on to say, "The DEQ Lewiston Region Office

considers this project to be an excellent opportunity to reduce possible impacts to the Palouse River. We recommend that Commerce help the City complete their improvement plan by providing CDBG funding for this project.” A copy of this letter and his updated letter of November 14, 2008, may be found in Appendix 7.

Specifically, this project’s work will consist of the replacement of over two (2) miles of 8” sewer mains, and almost 50 manholes. Additionally, a force main to the sewer lagoons will be replaced and the lagoons will be lined to prevent leaking.

The EPA’s recent interest in Potlatch raises the specter of federal agency fines and is why this project is a priority over any other facilities and infrastructures listed in the above matrix.

C. Project Description:

Identify the specific components of the project that are to be completed. Identify which will be completed with grant funds and those that will be completed with other funding. This section should be detailed enough that it can be used to write a contract scope of work. Also include a site plan showing the boundaries of the project area and the existing infrastructure in comparison to the project improvements.

Phase II of the construction of a new wastewater system will continue to eliminate the inordinate amount of inflow and infiltration currently occurring in Potlatch. This I & I impacts the ability of the City’s sewer lagoons to properly act upon the City’s wastewater and can cause the City to be out of compliance with its discharge permit. The project will include:

- 12,000 LF – 8” Sewer Main Replacement
- 47 – Manhole Replacement
- 250 LF - Force Main Replacement
- 360,000 SF - Sewer lagoon liner

Grant funds will not be dedicated to specific elements of the project but will be spent sequentially, that is, City and CDBG funds will be spent first, RD loan funds second and RD grant funds last. Using CDBG funds first reduces the amount of construction interest expense in the project.

A map of the project location and site plan may be found in Appendix 1.

D. Project Land & Permits: Answer the following questions and attach documentation.

1. Has any land, buildings, easements or right-of-ways been purchased for this project?

___ Yes ___X___ No

List date of Purchase _____

What funds were used to make this purchase? _____

2. Will any land, buildings, easements or right-of-ways be needed for this project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Status of the purchase: _____

3. Is anyone living on the land or in the structures at the proposed site?

☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Is any business being conducted on the land or in the structures at the proposed site?

☐ Yes ☒ No

5. Are there any businesses, individuals, or farms being displaced as a result of this project?

☐ Yes ☒ No

6. Are there permits that will be needed for the project; i.e. well, water rights, land application, demolition permits, zoning permit, air quality permit, etc?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Status of the permits (include plan for securing permits): None required.

7. Describe the ownership/lease arrangements for the property involved in the project.

Public rights-of-way and City property will be used for the project

VIII. Budget Narrative: Describe the source and status of all funding for the project according to the instructions in Part A of this Chapter.

In August 2007 the citizens of Potlatch passed a \$4,900,000 sewer revenue bond to fund a portion of the project cost. The remaining \$3,123,392 of the bond will be used for this project with USDA-Rural Development buying the bond and also providing a grant in the amount of \$1,631,000 for additional funds. The City has spent its own funds in pre-application engineering and planning cost.

X. Idaho Community Development Block Grant Budget Form (Use only line items on pages V-7 & V-8)
Applicant or Grantee: CITY OF POTLATCH Project Name: SEWER SYSTEM CONSTRUCTION

LINE ITEMS	ICDBG Cash	City Cash	City In-Kind	USDA/ RD Grant	State* DEQ Grant	Local* Bond RD	Private Cash	Private In- Kind	Total
Administrative**	\$ 48,750	\$ 2,500							\$51,250
Land, Structures, Rights of Way									
Engineering						\$813,863			813,863
Construction	451,250			\$1,631,000		2,230,779			4,313,029
Legal & Audit		2,000				3,750			5,750
Interest						75,000			75,000
TOTAL COSTS**	\$500,000	\$4,500		\$1,631,000		\$3,123,392			\$5,258,892

*Identify funding source

**Administrative expenses and project planning design costs, when totaled, shall not exceed 10% of the total ICDBG amount.

XI. Detailed Cost Analysis

1. Have preliminary plans and specs been submitted to regulatory agencies for review?
☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list date submitted: June 2007

If no, list expected date to be submitted: _____

2. Has final design (for bidding) begun? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, % complete: 75% (SEE PLAN SET IN APPENDIX 1)

If no, what is expected start date: N/A

3. Will project include bid alternatives to meet project budget if necessary?

☒ Yes ☐ No

4. Are Davis Bacon wage rates applicable to the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, are they included in the project costs? ☒ Yes ☐ No

5. Have known environmental measures been included in project costs? (ex: dust mitigation, archaeological survey, storm water drainage, wetland mitigation etc.)

☒ Yes ☐ No

6. What will expected construction contingency be at final design? 15%

7. List the last date the owner and design professional discussed project design and details.

Date: 11-8-08

8. Design Professional Cost Estimate may be found in Appendix 2.

XII. Project Schedule

Project Activity	Date (to be) Completed	Documentation in Appendix
Grant Administrator Procured	March 2006	5
Design Professional	May 2006	5
Other Funding Secured	October 2007	3
Permits Identified & Secured	N/A	
Subrecipient Agreement Drafted	N/A	
Construction Documents Complete	January 2009	
Environmental Review Complete	April 2009	
Complete 504 Requirements	January 2009	
Complete Fair Housing Requirements	January 2009	
Bids Advertised	February 2009	
Start Construction	May 2009	
Second Public Hearing	September 2009	
Certificate of Substantial Completion	December 2009	
Closeout	December 2009	

Name of Professional and Agency Contacts	Firm/Agency	Phone	Topic
Engineer	Chris Mansfield, P.E.	509/328-3371	Design
Bond Counsel	Mike Moore	208/331-1800	Bond Issue
Funding Agency	Howard Lunderstadt, USDA-RD	208/762-4939	Funding
Environmental Officer	Walter Steed	208/883-0123	Envron.
Regulatory Compliance	DEQ – Lewiston	208/799-4370	Reg.
Finance Officer	Debbie Perry	208/875-0708	City Clerk

XIII. Grantee and Sub-recipient Financial Profiles

Is the Grantee a (circle one)

☐ City

County

If a sub-recipient, what type of Organization (circle one)

Water District

Sewer District

Homeowner's Association

For-Profit Company

Non-Profit Company

Water Association

Fire District

Hospital District

Other (please explain): _____

**INSTRUCTIONS

For all projects complete Sections III & IV

For all projects that pertain to water complete Section I, III, & IV.

For all projects that pertain to sewer complete Section II, III & IV.

Section I. Water System (only) - Input information for the water system (entity) that is expected to utilize the Idaho Community Block Grant funds.

Water Source(s): ____ Wells ____ River ____ Lake ____ Springs ____ Purchase ____ Other

Water Treatment Method _____

Number of people served by the system _____

Number of hook-ups on the system _____

Number of equivalent dwelling units
(EDU's) on the system _____

Number of residential EDUs _____

Number of commercial EDUs _____

Number of industrial EDUs _____

Number of Wells _____

Number of Fire Hydrants _____

Storage Reservoir (gallons) _____

Water piping (linear feet) _____

Are all system users on meters _____

Are meters consistently read _____

For residential users, what is the average monthly

Water rate for 10,000 gallons \$ _____

When was the last rate increase _____

How much were the rates increased \$ _____

Annual water system revenue \$ _____

Current funds in capital improvement account \$ _____

Current funds in reserve fund \$ _____

Total dollar amount owed by customers in arrears \$ _____

Annual water system expenses \$ _____

Residential Hook-Up Fee	\$ _____
Commercial Hook-up Fee	\$ _____
Industrial Hook-Up Fee	\$ _____

Value and description of assets:

Land	\$ _____
Buildings	\$ _____
Equipment	\$ _____
Other	\$ _____
Total Asset Value	\$ _____

Identify outstanding indebtedness:

Years remaining	Annual Payment	Lender
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Explain Water Conservation Methods Implemented: _____
_____.

Section II. Sewer System (only) Input information for the sewer system (entity) that is expected to utilize the Idaho Community Block Grant funds.

Sewer Treatment Method Chlorinated/evaporative lagoons

Do you have a Pre-treatment system? ____ Yes X No

Number of people served by the system	791
Number of residential connection on the system	357
Number of commercial connection on the system	58
Number of industrial connection on the system	-0-
Number of new connections within the last year	-0-
Treatment System capacity (million gallons)	0.16 million/day
Sewer piping (linear feet)	25,000 LF
Number of lift stations	1
What are the current residential sewer rates	\$41.00
When was the last rate increase	10/1/08
How much were the rates increased	\$10.00
Residential Connection Fee	\$1500.00
Commercial Connection Fee	\$1500.00
Industrial Connection Fee	N/A

Annual sewer system revenue	\$91,144
Current funds in reserve account	\$19,332
Current funds in capitol improvement account	\$48,835
Current dollar amount owned by customers in arrears	\$ 3,519
Annual sewer system expenses	\$12,120

Value and description of assets:

Land	\$ _____
Buildings	\$1,940,250
Equipment	\$ 744,700
Other	\$ 215,000
Total Asset Value	\$2,899,950

Identify outstanding indebtedness:

Years remaining	Annual Payment	Lender
____28____	81,034	____USDA____
____5____	1,175	____USDA____
_____	_____	_____

Section III. All Applications (except Sewer and Water):**Grantee or Sub-Recipient Taxing Authority:**

A. Identify how the organization obtains its operating funding, i.e. bonds, district assessments, other:
 _____ taxes, bonds, fees _____

B. Does the organization have taxing authority? ☒ Yes ☐ No (if no, skip to Section IV)

1. Do you tax? ☒ Yes ☐ No

a) If yes:

(1) What is the tax rate? ____the maximum allowed by law____

(2) What is the annual tax amount generated? ____\$ 73,189____

(3) What are the taxes used to pay for, i.e. equipment, operating expenses, etc.? ☐ General
 Operating funds _____

2. If your organization does not tax explain why. ____N/A____

Section IV. All Applicants**Grantee Financial Summary (based on most current audit report)****Revenue**

Taxes	\$ 73,189
Licenses and Permits	\$ _____
Intergovernmental	\$ 52,109
Charge for Services	\$ _____
Miscellaneous	\$ 217,658
Other _____	\$ _____

Total Annual Revenue **\$342,956**

Expenses

Total Annual Expenditures **\$323,154**

Section V. All Applicants

Growth Management Planning

When was the comprehensive plan last updated? 1997

Which of the following tools do you implement as land use measures and controls?

	Yes	No
Building Codes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historical Preservation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conventional Zoning Ordinances	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other Zoning Options: (see below)		
Bonus or Incentive Zoning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Example: allows for increased residential densities if developer will include affordable housing options		
Transfer of Development Rights	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Example: transfer development rights to areas where development is wanted and to restrict it in areas where it is not		
Planned Unit Development (PUD)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Example: allows for creative and innovative design at same time creating amenities for public benefit. (Mixed-use development)		
Development Agreements	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contract between municipality and developer. Municipality specifies what the developer may do and what they are required to do within project area.		

Do you currently implement any of the following?

	Yes	No
Economic Development Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development Impact Fees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Local Option Tax (resort)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Toll roads	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Distance Based Impact Fees	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tree City USA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

XIV. Community Demographic Profile

Instructions: Complete the un-shaded areas using census data for the city/county applicant.

The census data can be located on our Web site at: <http://community.idaho.gov>

Name of Applicant: City of Potlatch_____

	TOTALS
TOTAL POPULATION BENEFITED (if different from city/county population in census)	791
TOTAL POPULATION IN APPLICANT'S AREA	791
Total Male	387
Total Female	404
Total White	763
Percent of White Population	96.5%
MINORITY POPULATION	
Black/African American	0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	7
Asian	2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
American Indian/Alaskan Native and White	4
Asian and White	0
Black/African American and White	0
American Indian/Alaskan Native and Black/African American	0
Other Multi-Racial	4
Hispanic	11
TOTAL MINORITY POPULATION	28
Percent of Population	3.5%
SENIOR CITIZENS	
Total Persons 65 Years and Over	118
Percent of Minority Population	14.9%
DISABILITY STATUS	
Civilian Non-institutionalized Population 16 to 64	459
Percent with a Work Disability	10.0%
Civilian Non-institutionalized Population 65 Years and Over	72
Percent with a Disability	51.4%
FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD	
Total Households	332
Female Householder, No Husband Present	40
Percent of Households	12.0%

XV. Review and Ranking Narrative: Refer to the chapter of this manual that addresses the type of project the community is proposing (Public Facility/Housing, Economic Development, Downtown Revitalization, Senior/Community Center). There will be an outline of the ranking criteria used by the Idaho Department of Commerce to make recommendations to the Economic Advisory Council. Be sure to address each ranking criterion, and if a criterion does not apply to the project, state it as such. Be sure to complete all of the forms included within the chapter as well.

E. Eligible Activity Priority Ranking Sheet

Fill in the percentage of the project's budget that will be spent on the following activities. The Total Points Awarded column will be completed by department staff.

Eligible Activity	Points Possible	Percentage of ICDBG Budget Spent on Activity	Total Points Awarded
Acquisition of Real Property	100		
Acquisition of Real Property for Housing Projects	50		
Public Facilities and Improvements-Health and Safety Related	100	90.25%	
Public Facilities and Improvements-Housing Related	75		
Public Facilities and Improvements-Social Service Related	50		
Engineering-Architectural	100		
Code Enforcement	50		
Clearance and Demolition	10		
Removal of Architectural Barriers	50		
Rental Income Payments	0		
Disposition of Property	10		
Public Services	0		
Completion of Urban Renewal Projects	0		
Relocation Payments	25		
Planning Activities	0		
Administration Activities	100	9.75 %	
Grants to Nonprofit Community Organizations	0		
Grants to Nonprofit Community Organizations for Housing Projects	75		
Energy Planning	0		
Housing Rehabilitation	75		
Total Points Awarded to Project			

II. National Objectives: Complete the need and impact for the project type that is Public Facilities.

A. NEED: (½ page narrative)

Critical health and safety concerns are the paramount reasons for funding this application. The City's sewer collection system was installed in 1909 and, while having been maintained, is currently in disrepair and has exceeded its useful life. During rainfall events the system is experiencing 200 to 300 percent increases in flow. A full replacement has been recommended in order to eliminate excessive inflow and infiltration, and consequently improve the treatment efficiency of the lagoon system. In addition to recent violations reported in March of 2007 for Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD) removal infractions, the City received notification from the EPA on January 23, 2007 regarding an October 5, 2006 Compliance Inspection.

While the City has used part of a \$4,900,000 bond issue to provide matching funds to begin sanitary sewer main replacement under a Phase I project, further work is needed to correct I & I impacts to their treatment lagoons.

Thomas J. Moore, P.E., Regional Engineering Manager for the Department of Environmental Quality in Lewiston said in his October 12, 2007, letter, "After seeing the video inspections obtained for the Facility Plan, it is apparent that the City sewer system is severely compromised and promptly replacing these sewer lines is in order." He goes on to say, "The DEQ Lewiston Region Office considers this project to be an excellent opportunity to reduce possible impacts to the Palouse River. We recommend that Commerce help the City complete their improvement plan by providing CDBG funding for this project." A copy of this letter and his updated letter of November 14, 2008, may be found in Appendix 7.

B. IMPACT: (½ page narrative)

- (1) What benefits will Low and Moderate Income persons receive from this project?
- (2) What are the ramifications if the project is not funded, i.e., higher rates, lack of facility, loss of property, etc.
- (3) If the project comes in over budget, what components will be cut?
- (4) If a component is cut, what will the grantee do to continue the improvement
- (5) What procedures will be developed to measure short and long-term permanent impacts of the project?

The benefits to Low and Moderate income persons will receive from this project are the operation of a wastewater collection and treatment system in Potlatch that is adequate to meet the city's needs, protect the environment of the Palouse River and increase economic development prospects. Without the proposed project, continued sewer system inflow and infiltration by ground water would make the lagoon treatment

system unable to process sewage to the degree it must be in order to be discharged into the Palouse River. Contamination of the river would lead to EPA fines being assessed against the community and even possibly orders to stop discharges. This would effectively do away with any sewer system in Potlatch.

This is the second of a two-phase project using over half of the \$4.9 million bond issue. Recent changes in the bidding climate have given the City the opportunity to get all work proposed in the preliminary engineering report accomplished.

However, should some lines not get replaced, the City could either replace them over time by allocating funds annually or look down the road for another project with other sources of funding. Both of these are stretches and it is felt the project will be able to be built as proposed.

The short-term impact benefits will be the avoidance of any potential EPA consent order due to contamination of the Palouse River. Long-term impacts will be evidenced by Potlatch's ability to grow and prosper economically, which will certainly not be the case if this project is not funded.

III. Project Categories

A.

1. **Design Professional Documentation**– The City has hired, through proper procurement processes, Taylor Engineering, Inc. of Coeur d'Alene to perform the Preliminary Engineering Report and subsequently to act as project engineer for design and construction. Documentation of the advertisement and rating and ranking can be found in Appendix 6.
2. **Grant Administration Documentation** – The City has, after following appropriate procurement practices, hired W. M. Steed & Associates of Moscow, an Idaho Department of Commerce certified grant administrator, to assist in the making of this application and to provide administrative services for the project. Documentation of the advertisement and rating and ranking can be found in Appendix 5. The contract for administrative services has been sent previously under separate cover.
3. **Plan or Studies** – In 2006 the City hired Taylor Engineering to do a Preliminary Engineering Report on the condition of the wastewater collection and treatment system. The July 2007 Report, which, due to joint treatment, was a Regional report encompassing the cities of Potlatch and Onaway. Less Appendices, it may be found in Appendix 8. It was submitted to DEQ and has been accepted. The study developed system repair alternatives and the City elected to replace all of the City of Potlatch's collection system. Rising costs of construction and the City's belief in the citizens' willingness to tax themselves were prime considerations in this decision.

4. **Planning for specific project type: Water and Sewer system projects** – (Provide a conditional approval issued by DEQ of the facilities study or the project's specifications and drawings) See Appendix 8 for DEQ's conditional approval of the Preliminary Engineering Report.
 5. **Environmental Scoping** – The ICDBG Environmental Scoping – The Field Note Checklist has been completed and environmental information request letters have been mailed and some responses received. Up-dates will be obtained during the formal Environmental Review. See Section XVIII of this application and Appendix 9.
 6. **Agency Viability** –
 - (1) **Utility Rate Review** - USDA has participated in a rate study for the proposed new sewer system project. See Appendix 3.
 - (2) **Completion of ICDBG Financial Profile Worksheet** – The completed worksheet may be found in Section XIII of this application.
 7. **Property Acquisition** – There is no property proposed to be acquired for the project. All existing sewer lines are in existing easements or rights-of-way and the treatment plant is on City property.
 8. **Funding Commitments** – The City of Potlatch passed their bond issue by an 83% positive vote. The bond attorney's opinion letter as well as Rural Development's commitment letter may be found in Appendix 3.
 9. **Schedule** – The schedule is shown in Section XII of this application.
 10. **Administrative Capacity** –
 - (1) Has the applicant completed a Section 504 or ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan? ☒ Yes ☐ No
Coordinator: City Clerk
 - (2) What is the most current building code the applicant has adopted? The City of Potlatch has adopted the 2003 International Building Code.
 - (3) Are the Fair Housing Accessibility Standards as a component of their building code? ☒ Yes ☐ No
- B. Cost Analysis** –
The Detailed Cost Analysis information can be found in Section XI of this application.

XVII. CERTIFICATIONS

I certify the data in this application is true and correct, that this document has been duly authorized by the governing body of Potlatch (city/county) and we will comply with the following laws and regulations if this application is approved and selected for funding.

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
- Civil Rights Act of 1964 Pub.L 88-352
- Civil Rights Act of 1968 Pub.L 90-284
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504
- Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (49 CFR Part 24)
- Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended Pub.L 93-383
- Davis-Bacon Act (40 USC 276a - 276a-5)
- Historic Preservation Act
- OMB Circular A-87, and ensure that sub-recipient complies with A-110 and A-122
- Section 106 of the Housing and Urban Recovery Act of 1983 certifying to:
 - Minimize displacement as a result of activities assisted with CDBG funds by following the Idaho Department of Commerce & Labors anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan;
 - Conduct and administer its program in conformance with Title VI and Title VIII, and affirmatively further fair housing;
 - Provide opportunities for citizen participation comparable to the state's requirements (those described in Section 104(a) of the Act, as amended);
 - Not use assessments or fees to recover the capital costs of ICDBG funded public improvements from low and moderate income owner occupants;
 - Abide by all state and federal rules and regulations related to the implementation and management of federal grants;
 - Assess and implement an Accessibility Plan for persons with disabilities in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended;
 - Adopt and implement an Excessive Force Policy;
 - Prohibition of Use of Assistance for Employment Relocation, Section 588 of the Disability Housing and work Responsibility Act of 1998 Pub. L 105-276.
 - Anti-Lobbying Certification: No federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of, employee of a member of, officer of or employee of Congress in connection with the awarding of any federal contract, the making of any federal grant or loan, the entering into any cooperative agreement and the extension, renewal, modification or amendment of any federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement.

If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of, employee of a member of, officer of or employee of Congress in connection with this federal grant, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

Signed by Chief Elected Official

November 21, 2008

Date

David Brown, Mayor
Typed Name

XVIII. ICDBG Environmental Scoping - Field Notes Checklist

Applicant City of Potlatch Sub Recipient N/A

This site and desk review checklist is to be completed by the Applicant and submitted with the application.

The purpose of the checklist is to help the Applicant and ICL better understand what environmental statutes or provisions per 24 CFR 58 might impact the proposed project. The information will assist in understanding what studies, documentation, and mitigation measures could be applicable and to assist in completing the environmental review record. The Applicant may choose to attach this scoping checklist as part of the environmental review record.

1. Limitations on Activities

Is the Grantee planning or in the process of acquiring property for this proposed project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, is the Applicant aware that land acquired or site work after submission of the ICDBG application is subject to 24 CFR 58.22 Limitation on Activities Requiring Clearance? Meaning once an application for ICDBG funds is submitted, neither Applicant or sub recipient, may commit Non-HUD funds to a project for land acquisition or site work (except for minor testing) before the environmental review is complete, unless the land acquisition or contract is conditioned on completion of the ICDBG environmental review.

2. Historic Preservation

Has the SHPO or THPO been notified of the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Have tribes with possible cultural and religious sites been notified of the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Floodplain Management

Is the project located within a floodway or floodplain designated on a current FEMA map? Check Web site <http://store.msc.fema.gov/> ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Sure

If yes what is the floodplain map number? _____

If yes, is the project is located in a floodway or floodplain is the community where the project is taking place a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program. Check Web site www.idwr.idaho.gov/water/flood ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Wetland Protection

Are there ponds, marshes, bogs, swamps, drainage ways, streams, rivers, or other wetlands on or near the site? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, has the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) been notified? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Has the Corps indicated what permit level will be required? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

5. Sole Source Aquifers (Clean Water Act)

Is the proposed project located over an EPA designated aquifer area? ☐ Yes ☒ No
(check website www.epa.gov/safewater/ssanp.html)

Is it known at this time if construction will disturb more than one acre of land? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has a general permit for storm water discharges from construction sites been applied for from the EPA? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Endangered Species Act

Has U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Fisheries, and Idaho Fish and Game Regional Office been notified about the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

7. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Is the project located within one mile of a designated wild and scenic river? Idaho wild and scenic rivers include portions of the St. Joe, Lochsa, Selway, Middle Fork of the Clearwater, Snake, Rapid, and Middle Fork of the Salmon. Check Web site www.nps.gov/rivers/ ☐ Yes ☒ No

8. Clean Air Act

Is the project located in a designated non-attainment area for criteria air pollutants? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For building demolition or improvements has an asbestos analysis been planned for or conducted?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

For housing rehabilitation has a lead based paint assessment been planned for or conducted?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

9. Farmland Protection Policy Act

Is the project located on a site currently zoned as residential, commercial, and/or industrial ?
☒ Yes ☐ No

Is the project area currently being utilized for farm or agricultural purposes ? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service or local planning department been notified about the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No

10. Environmental Justice

Does project have a disproportionate environmental impact on low income or minority populations?
☐ Yes ☒ No

11. Noise Abatement and Control

Is the project new construction or rehabilitation of noise sensitive use (i.e. housing, mobile home parks, nursing homes, hospitals, and other uses where quiet is integral to the project functions)?
☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes is the project located within 5 miles of an airport, 1000 feet of a major highway or busy road, or 3,000 feet of a railroad. ☐ Yes ☐ No

12. Explosive and Flammable Operations

Is the physical structure (not necessarily infrastructure) intended for residential, institutional, recreational, commercial or industrial use? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, are there any above ground explosives, flammable fuels or chemical containers within one mile of the physical structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, have you been able to identify what the container is holding and the container's size?

☐ Yes ☐ No

13. Toxic Chemicals and Radioactive Materials

Are there any known hazardous materials, contamination, chemicals, gases, and radioactive substance on or near the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain _____

During the visual inspection of the site is there signs of distressed vegetation, vents or fill pipes, storage/oil tanks, stained soil, dumped material, questionable containers, foul or noxious odors, etc.

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain _____

At this time is the site's previous uses known to have been gasoline stations, train depots, dry cleaners, agricultural operations, repair shops, landfill, etc.? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Are other funding agencies requiring the Grantee to perform an American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) environmental assessment? ASTM assessment involves analysis of site uses and ownership, inspection of site, and possible testing. ☐ Yes ☒ No

14. Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones

Is the project located within a designated airport runway clear zone or protection zone? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Does the project involve acquisition of land or construction/rehabilitation of building or infrastructure in an airport runway clear zone or protection zone? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, is the grantee aware that the airport operator may wish to purchase the property at some point in the future as part of a clear or accident zone acquisition program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

15. Energy Efficient Designs

For building construction has the owner investigated possible incentives from power providers, such as Idaho Power, Avista, or Utah Power for incorporating energy efficient design into their building?

☐ Yes ☐ No

16. Other Environmental Reviews

Have facilities studies or other environmentally related site reviews been conducted or in the process of being conducted? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, are there any identified concerns or recommended mitigation measures? ☐ Yes ☒ No

List if known - _____

17. Information Letters

The advanced mailing of environmental information letters is sought in an effort to minimize the project's timeline in waiting for necessary documentation or information. It will assist in earlier responses to required mitigation measures should the proposed project receive grant funding.

Check the agencies that have been mailed an environmental information letter.

- ☒ Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer
- ☒ Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or Tribal Office
- ☒ Idaho Department of Water Resources
- ☒ Army Corps of Engineers (if wetlands are applicable)
- ☒ U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- ☒ NOAA Fisheries (if salmon and/or steelhead are applicable)
- ☒ Idaho Fish and Game
- ☐ USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (if farmlands are applicable)
- ☒ Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
- ☐ Local Government – Planning Department
- ☐ Others _____

Completion of the scoping checklist does not constitute that all environmental provisions or clauses related to 24 CFR 58 Environmental Reviews have been met or are known at this time.

____ Walter Steed _____
Completed By

____ 11-11-08 ____
Date

ALPHABETICAL APPENDIX	
Bond Attorney Letter	3
Citizens Participation Plan	4
Cost Estimates	2
Engineer Contracted	6
Engineer MBE/WBE Submitted	6
Engineer Rating and Ranking	6
Engineer Selection Published	6
Environmental Rev. Officer Appointed	5
Environmental Scoping Letters and Responses	9
Grant Writer Contracted	5
Grant Writer MBE/WBE Submitted	5
Grant Writer Rating and Ranking	5
Grant Writer Solicitation Published	5
Labor Market Profile	10
Letter of Support from DEQ	7
Meeting Minutes on Engineer Selection	6
Meeting Minutes on Grant Writer Selection	5
Minutes of Public Hearing	4
Notice of Public Hearing	4
Operator Licenses	11
Preliminary Engineering Report	8
Project Maps	1
Sources of Local Match	3
USDA-RD Support Letter	3

NUMERICAL APPENDIX	
Project Maps	1
Cost Estimates	2
Sources of Local Match	3
USDA-RD Support Letter	3
Bond Attorney Letter	3
Citizens Participation Plan	4
Notice of Public Hearing	4
Minutes of Public Hearing	4
Environmental Rev. Officer Appointed	5
Grant Writer Contracted	5
Grant Writer Solicitation Published	5
Grant Writer MBE/WBE Submitted	5
Meeting Minutes on Grant Writer Selection	5
Grant Writer Rating and Ranking	5
Engineer Contracted	6
Engineer Selection Published	6
Engineer MBE/WBE Submitted	6
Meeting Minutes on Engineer Selection	6
Engineer Rating and Ranking	6
Letter of Support from DEQ	7
Preliminary Engineering Report	8
Environmental Scoping Letters and Responses	9
Labor Market Profile	10
Operator Licenses	11